

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The Office Action mailed November 16, 2004 acknowledges that Battie does not disclose the length of the pawl thick section being greater than half the difference between the inner wall diameter and the outer diameter of the shank but notes that the claims are limited to a device, rather than a combination of the device with a stud.

Claims 1-3 have been amended to recite the mounting device in combination with a threaded stud. There is no teaching or suggestion in the prior art of the combination recited, with the dimensional relationships recited in Claim 1. These dimensional relationships are important to ensure the reliable engagement of the pawls with the stud. See the paragraph bridging pages 5-6 of Applicant's specification. Accordingly, Claims 1-3 should be allowed.

Claim 6 (amended to include the subject matter of cancelled Claims 4 and 5 with appropriate modification) recites that the pawl has a pair of engaging sections at opposite sides of a section of the pawl substantially thicker than a section of the pawl forming the hinge, and has a pair of grooves adjacent to respective engaging sections, each engaging section being disposed for entering a space between successive crests of threads of the stud while an adjacent groove receives one of the crests of the stud, irrespective of the direction of insertion of the stud into the bore.

The rejection of Claim 6 proposes to combine the teachings of Courtin with the teachings of Battie. This proposal is untenable, firstly, because it is apparent that there is no motivation for the proposed combination.

The mode of operation of Battie is described in column 2, lines 55-65, to wit:

After the entry of the threaded bolt (10) into the funnel opening (9), first the entry-side support lands (12) are forced apart. Then the reinforced ends (16) of the spring tongues (16) [(15) sic] are forced up (FIG. 5) and pivoted in front of the catch projections (14) of the support beams (13) of the opposingly oriented support lands (11), whereupon the latter give way to rest on the side walls (4) and (5). This causes the reinforced ends (16) of the spring tongues (15) to be wedged between the beams (13) and the threaded bolt (10) and therefore to be pressed firmly against the threading of the threaded bolt (10) (FIG. 6).

It is apparent that Battie requires that the reinforced ends (16) of the spring tongues (15) are wedged between the beams (13) and the threaded bolt (10) and are therefore pressed firmly against the threading of the threaded bolt (10). Such firm pressing relies upon wedging action which does not require any particular configuration of the reinforced ends (16) of the spring tongues (15). It is significant that the reinforced ends (16) of the spring tongues (15) are merely un-contoured blocks.

A person of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to contour such blocks, in view of Courtin, because the un-contoured blocks are entirely sufficient to accomplish the purpose of firm pressure against the threading of the threaded bolt under the wedging action.

The support beams (13) of Battie are similar to the

catch (6) of Courtin in their construction and engagement with the threads of a bolt. Thus, while the catch (6) of Courtin is relevant to the support beams (13) of Battie, it is not relevant to the spring tongues (15) of Battie.

Furthermore, the single catch (6) of Courtin for unidirectional engagement with a threaded rod would not suggest to a person of ordinary skill in the art a modification of the spring tongues (15) of Battie to provide Applicant's bi-directional engagement with a threaded bolt, particularly since, as stated above, there is no reason to modify the spring tongues (15) of Battie, which are firmly pressed against the threading of a threaded bolt by a wedging action that requires no contouring of the spring tongues.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 6 and dependent Claims 7 and 8 should be allowed together with Claims 1-3.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to Deposit Account No. 50-1165 any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 that may be required by this paper and to credit any overpayment to that Account. If any extension of time is required in connection with the filing of this

paper and has not been requested separately, such extension
is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NHS:lmb

Miles & Stockbridge P.C.
1751 Pinnacle Drive
Suite 500
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 903-9000

By: Nelson H. Shapiro
Nelson H. Shapiro
Reg. No. 17,095

April 18, 2005